



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/556,125

11/09/2005

Edward C. Meagher

2897 US

4353

50855

7590

08/25/2009

Tyco Healthcare Group LP
60 MIDDLETOWN AVENUE
NORTH HAVEN, CT 06473

EXAMINER

WEEKS, GLORIA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3721

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/556,125	Applicant(s) MEAGHER, EDWARD C.	
	Examiner GLORIA R. WEEKS	Art Unit 3721	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) GLORIA R. WEEKS. (3) EDWARD MEAGHER.

(2) PAUL DURAND. (4) RUSSEL S. SALERNO.

Date of Interview: 10 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: DeFonzo et al. and Hermes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner's interpretation of the term rupturable, was discussed, as well as what element(s) correspond to the rupturable limitation(s) of Applicant's claimed invention. Examiner agreed that there was a difference in the method of rupturing the fastener of the claimed invention and the fastener disclosed by DeFonzo et al. and Hermes, however that difference was not found to be articulated in the claim language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/PAUL R. DURAND/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721	
---	--